UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Randy P. Hope,)	C/A No. 0:15-2330-JFA-SVH
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
VS.)	ORDER
)	
Rock Hill School District III; Rebecca B.)	
Partlow; Michael Cox; and Al Leonard,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	
)))	

The *pro se* plaintiff, Randy P. Hope, brings this action contending that he was wrongfully discharged from Rock Hill School District III.

The Magistrate Judge assigned to this action¹ has prepared a Report and Recommendation wherein she suggests that this court should dismiss the action for failure to effect service on the defendants pursuant to Rule 4 and for lack of prosecution pursuant to Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The Report sets forth in detail the relevant facts and standards of law on this matter, and the court incorporates such without a recitation.

The plaintiff was advised of his right to file objections to the Report and

¹ The Magistrate Judge's review is made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02. The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

0:15-cv-02330-JFA Date Filed 01/06/16 Entry Number 24 Page 2 of 2

Recommendation, which was entered on the docket on December 23, 2015. On December

29, 2015, the plaintiff mailed a document to the court requesting a 10-day extension of time

to serve the defendants. The plaintiff asserts that he was out of town from December 6 to

December 26, 2015 and he received the Magistrate Judge's Report on the 26th. For good

cause shown, the plaintiff's motion for an extension of time is granted (ECF No. 23). The

plaintiff is hereby advised that service on the defendants must be completed on or before

February 1, 2016. No further extensions will be granted.

Because it now appears that the plaintiff wishes to continue to prosecute this action,

the Court will not adopt the Report and Recommendation. The Clerk is requested to return

this file back to the Magistrate Judge for further handling.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Joseph F. anderson, J.

January 6, 2016

Columbia, South Carolina

Joseph F. Anderson, Jr. United States District Judge

2